(166)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH: HON'BLE SHRI S.R. NAYAK, CJ.

Writ Petition No.4788 of 2005

PETITIONER	:	N.B. Singh, aged about 34 years, S/o Late Shri Jodhan Singh, R/o. H-1/20, Narmada Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
	Vs.	
RESPONDENTS	1.	State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Government of Chhattisgarh Department of Co-operative Societies, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
	2.	The Secretary, Government of Chhattisgarh Department of Co-operative Societies, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
	3.	The Director Department of Geology & Mining, Sonakhan Telibandha, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
	4.	The Collector (Mining) District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
	5.	The Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
	6.	The Tahsildar Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
	7.	Liquidator, Adarsha Samuhik Sahakari Samiti, Jairam Nagar, Registration No.2932, Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
	8.	Shri Satyajeet Dahariya, S/o. Shri Jairam Dahariya, R/o. Gram Ppst Deogaon, Police Station Masturi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---

Present : Shri R.K. Agrawal, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Vinay Harit, learned Dy. Advocate General for the State of Chhattisgarh and its Authorities.
Shri Prateek Sinha, learned counsel for respondents 7 & 8.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 4th September, 2006)

Against the impugned order of the Collector, the 4th respondent herein, dated 17.08.2005, an appeal lies to the Director Department of

167

Geology & Mining, the 3rd respondent herein. It is pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that another appeal arising out of the same proceedings is already pending before the 3rd respondent for adjudication. If that is so, it is appropriate for the petitioner to prefer appeal against the impugned order of the Collector dated 17.08.2005 also. However, it was contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the Collector has no jurisdiction to pass the impugned order. Even this contention could be pressed into service in the appeal that may be preferred to the 3rd respondent against the order of the Collector dated 17.08.2005. In that view of the matter, I decline to entertain this writ petition. It is accordingly dismissed, however, reserving liberty to the petitioner to prefer an appeal to the 3rd respondent against the order of the Collector dated 17.08.2005. No costs.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

Brajesh